

Acknowledgements

- Susan Chipman provided support and anxiety suggestion.
- Wayne Gray and Roman Belavkin have helped develop our thinking in this area.
- · Marsha Lovett provided WM task

4ST PENNSIATE

This project was supported by the US Office of Navy Research, award number N000140110547 and by the Space and by the Naval Warfare Systems Center, San Diego, No. N6600-01-1-8916.

The views expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the positions or the policies of the U.S. Government, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

IST PENNSTATE

Motivation for Modeling Moderators

- Modeling cognition and affect including stress (multiple behavioral moderators that influence architecture processing)
- Important for modeling aspects of human-computer interactions
- Extending computer-generated forces
- Example validated model







IST PENNSTATE

Subtraction Data: Neutral and Non-neutral Appraisal

- Subtask of many military tasks
- Relevant data to hand
- % correct from article and attempts
- Problem is that we will need more detailed data with moderators active
 - >Typically, with moderators active only gross performance measures are taken





IST	PENNSTATE		10 20/7/d				
		Its	Overlay				
	Pre-task appraisal	Challenge leads to more attempts, less errors	Decrease Expected-Gain- Noise (0.1) Increase circulation, generally *				
		Threat leads to fewer attempts, more errors	Increase Expected-Gain- Noise (1.0) Complex changes in circulatory system * Rule fires, using time and decreasing working memory activation				
	Anxiety	Same as threat					
	Caffeine	Increased alertness with inverted U-shaped curve	Affects threshold at end of 4 min. run for Challenging post-task appraisal*				
		At moderate doses decreased RT	Indirect through task appraisal*				
		Exacerbate the effects of anxiety	Decrease error threshold needed for post-task appraisal being "threat"*				
	* Indicate	es not in released version.					

Con	trol Panel 🔤 🔤 🛛	Model Behavior
odel Edit	Hel	Durrant Number t at Attempt
♦ Threat	pmr l au	
Noutral	240 84	6153
🕹 Challenge	RELOAD	# of Errors
III Rowied	SCRIPT 1	Number in Memory 0
] worried		19 18 17 16 15
□ (5)(1)		14 13 12 11 10 Tesk-Time in
aoe	400 500 900 1009	09 08 07 06 06 0
Calle	ane Level (Bg)	
		Norry Indicator 😡
Sc	ript Data	
Sc Trial 1	Trial 2	Apprais
Sc Trial 1 pro-task apprais	Trial 2	Apprais
So Trial 1 pro-tack apprais post-tack apprais	Trial 2 pro-taok appraio prot-taok appraio	Appreis Post-Task Appreis al
Sc Trial 1 pro-task apprais post-task apprais t of attempts	ript Data Trial 2 pro-teck appraie protiteck appraie s of attempts	Approis
St Trial 1 pro-task apprais post-task apprais t of attempts t of attempts t of errors	ript Data Trial 2 pro-tack appraic protitack appraic s of attempts # of errors	Approis Fost-Task Appraisal
Sr Trial 1 pro-tack apprais post-tack apprais t of attempts # of errore Trial 3	ript Data Trial 2 pro-tack apprais post-tack apprais s of attempts # of arrors Trial 4	Apprais Pose-Yeak Appraisal
St Trial 1 pre-task apprais post-task apprais is of attempts is of errors Trial 3 pre-task apprais	ript Data Trial 2 pro-took apprato prot-took apprato s of attempts # of arrors Trial 4 pro-took apprato	Approis Doer-Task Appraisal
Se Trial 1 pre-tesk apprais t of attempts # of errore Trial 3 pre-tesk apprais poot-tesk apprais	ript Data Trial 2 pre-teck appeals protteck appeals # of errors Trial 4 pre-teck appeals protteck appeals	Approis Dost-Task Appraisal
Se Trial 1 pro-task apprais post-task apprais t of atranspa # of errore Trial 3 pro-task apprais t of atranspa t of atranspa	ript Data Trial 2 pre-tack appels post-tack appels # of artempts # of errors Trial 4 pre-tack appels post-tack appels s of artempts	Approis Dost-Task Appraisal Pro-Task Appraisal Pro-Task Appraisal Neutral

PENNSIAIE						12	20/7
Subtract	ions: P	redic	t	ed	а	.nd	A
Pretask appraisal	:	Challenge		Threat		Neutral	
Simulation	Attempts	57.6	>	46.2	<	70.7	
(N=10)	Number correct	53.2	>	42.1	<	70.7	
		92%		91%		100%	_
Simulation with Worry	Attempts	43.2	>	37.2	<	59.3	
(N=10)	Number correct	37.9	>	32.6	<	59.3	
		88%		88%		100%	_
Tomaka et al. (1993)	Attempts	61	>	46		n.a.	
	Number correct	56	>	42		n.a.	
		92%		91%			



Data to Be Modeled: Caffeine Qualitative performance: an inverted U-shaped curve: >Low and high levels of caffeine --> poor performance > Moderate levels of caffeine --> optimal performance Quantitative measures with this task needed from future study

• Also need a mapping from data to theory







4ST PENNSTATE

Open Questions / Conclusions

- ACT-R's model library is not yet large enough to cover tasks (about 1/4 of published 'available')
- ACT-R at 'normal' is too good, rule choice is perfect
- How to overlay multiple overlays?